

REMARKS

Applicant adds to the independent claims 2 and 9 the limitations of their respective dependent claims 3 and 10, thereby effectively rendering **moot** the rejection of the previous claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rzeszewski '481 in view of Kraft '229 (newly cited). The dependent claims 3 and 10 have been canceled, thereby making the currently amended claims 2 and 9 equal to the **previous** claims 3 and 10.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 3 (now claim 2) - 7, 10 (now claim 9) and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Rzeszewski '481 in view of Kraft '229 (**newly cited**) and Applicant's admitted prior art of Applicant's Figs. 1-3.

Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of the presently pending claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the subject matter of each of these claims was invented.

More specifically, the OSD menu of Applicant's FIG. 5A displays a plurality of broadcast channels on the same screen, along with the broadcasting channel menu 212, the frequency menu 213, the channel number menu, **and** the check box menu 211 to select or un-select the broadcasting channel displayed on the OSD, as **recited in claims 2 and 9**.

In **contrast**, Rzeszewski '481 discloses that a box displays **only** a number of selected favorite channels. Kraft '229 discloses a check box for a user to select a desired menu, but it does **not** disclose or even suggest that a frequency, or a channel number corresponding to the broadcasting channel is displayed, as claimed by Applicant.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not (and could not) have derived, from the combined disclosures of Rzeszewski, Kraft and the admitted prior art, an OSD menu, as claimed in claims 2 and 9, which displays the broadcasting channel menu, the frequency menu **and** the check box.

In summary, then, since the combination of Rzeszewski, Kraft and the admitted prior art does not teach, or even suggest, the subject matter, taken as a **whole**, the subject matter of the amended independent claims 2 and 9 and the pending dependent claims 4-7 and 11, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner also to withdraw the rejection of claims 3-7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with the currently amended claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/674,510

Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/
John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 19, 2006